



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/211,730	12/15/1998	KEITH C. THOMAS	450.241US1	9527

24333 7590 02/25/2003

GATEWAY, INC.
ATTN: SCOTT CHARLES RICHARDSON
610 GATEWAY DRIVE
MAIL DROP Y-04
N. SIOUX CITY, SD 57049

EXAMINER

KOENIG, ANDREW Y

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2611

DATE MAILED: 02/25/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/211,730

Applicant(s)

THOMAS, KEITH C. *PK*

Examiner

Andrew Y Koenig

Art Unit

2611

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE ____ MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 13 September 2002.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-29 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-29 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on ____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) ____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s) ____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments filed 13 September 2002 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.
2. Regarding claim 1, the applicant argues that Williams fails to teach detecting additional users (pg. 3, para. 3). The examiner disagrees in that, Williams teaches "a user recognition device that determines where an additional user is newly present in a given area having access to the display" as claimed. Given the broadest reasonable interpretation, Williams teaches recognizing at least one user (col. 11, ll. 2-21), which would be an additional user when there is no one else. Accordingly, the rejection for claim 1 is maintained.
3. Regarding claim 2, the applicant argues that Williams fails to deal with multiple users at a time, however, the examiner notes that the claim recites that the user recognition circuit includes an imaging input device and can distinguished among users, which is taught by Williams, see col. 11, ll. 12-21, col. 12, ll. 29-44, and fig. 2.
4. Regarding claims 7 and 24, the applicant argues that Williams fails to teach "determines which users are present in a given area." The examiner disagrees. The user recognition device of Williams clearly can identify a single user from a plurality of users (col. 11, ll. 22-27). Whereas the claims recites "users," is should be understood the Williams does teach the system for a plurality of user, which permits the interpretation of a single user for an hour and the next consecutive hour a different users uses the system. Accordingly, given the broadest reasonable interpretation in the

art, Williams teaches a user recognition circuit that determines which users are present in a given area.

5. Regarding claims 13 and 19, the applicant argues that Williams fails to teach "determining that a user is present in a given area" which has been addressed in the discussion of claim 1 above. The applicant argues that Williams fails to teach "which users are permitted to that content" and "controlling display of the content based on the access-allowed indication." The examiner disagrees. Williams teaches blocking programs based on the user (col. 10, ll. 61-65), clearly by blocking some content is not seen based on some indication in order to block out the content.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

6. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

7. Claims 1-3, 6-8, 10-11, 13-14, 16-17, 19-21, 24-25, and 27-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent 5,977,964 to Williams et al. (Williams).

8. Regarding claim 1, Williams discloses an apparatus for controlling access to information, wherein:

"a video display" shown in figure 1 (102), and described in column 3, line 51.

"a user-recognition input device" shown in Figure 1 (118, 120), Figure 7 (706), and described in column 11, ll. 2-21.

"a control device" shown in Figure 1 (104) and Figure 7 (704), and described in col. 10, ll. 55-65, and col. 15, ll. 44-63.

Regarding claims 2, 10, 16, 20, and 27, Williams discloses a user-recognition imaging apparatus and method as described in col. 11, ll. 12-21, fig. 2, col. 12, ll. 29-44.

Regarding claims 3, 11, 17, 21, 28, Williams discloses a user-recognition audio apparatus and method as described in col. 11, ll. 2012, fig. 2, and col. 12, ll. 29-44.

Regarding claim 6, Williams discloses a control device that selects predetermined channels based on a determination of the user via the user-recognition device (col. 10, ll. 61-65, and col. 11, ll. 22-48).

Regarding claims 7, 13, and 24, Williams discloses an apparatus for controlling access to information, wherein:

"a video display" shown in figure 1 (102), and described in column 3, line 51.

"a user-recognition input device" shown in Figure 1 (118, 120), Figure 7 (706), and described in column 11, ll. 2-21.

"a memory" shown in fig. 7, label 716 (see also col. 15, ll. 44-63).

"a processor" shown in fig. 1, label 104, and described in col. 10, ll. 55-65, and col. 15, ll. 44-63.

"a blocking device coupled to the processor" also reads on fig. 7, label 108 (see also col. 10, ll. 61-65, col. 15, ll. 44-63).

Regarding claims 8, 14, and 25, Williams discloses the video content including television programming (fig. 1, label 102, col. 4, ll. 33-36).

Regarding claim 19, Williams discloses an apparatus and method for controlling access to information based on content and user identity, wherein:

“outputting the information” see fig. 1, label 102, and col. 3, ll. 48-58.

“determining that an additional user is newly present” see fig. 2, col. 12, ll. 29-44.

“selectively blocking output of the information” shown in fig. 7, label 708, col. 10, ll. 61-65, and col. 15, ll. 44-63.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

9. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

10. Claims 4, 12, 18, 22, and 29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 5,977,964 to Williams et al. (Williams) in view of U.S. Patent 5,771,307 to Lu et al. (Lu).

11. Regarding claims 4, 12, 18, 22, and 29, Williams discloses an apparatus and method as claimed, but does not disclose the user of a movement detection device. Lu discloses a system, where a user-recognition device in a viewing area comprises a motion sensor (fig. 1, label 30, col. 8, ll. 52-63). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Williams

to include a motion sensor as disclosed by Lu in order to increase reliability and accuracy of viewer detection, when viewers enter or leave the viewing area.

12. Claims 5 and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 5,977,964 to Williams et al. (Williams) in view of U.S. Patent 5,231,494 to Wachob.

13. Regarding claims 5 and 23, Williams discloses an apparatus and method as claimed, but does not disclose a priority is assigned to a user and the display is based on the user's priority. Wachob teaches a targeted ad insertion system, which is based on the viewer's characteristics in a viewing area. Wachob implements a prioritization algorithm to determine which viewers among the plurality of viewers have priority so that the proper ads are displayed (col. 5-6, ll. 63-3). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Williams to include a prioritization algorithm as taught by Wachob in order to display the proper content the viewing audience thereby displaying targeted information to the users.

14. Claims 9, 15, and 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 5,977,964 to Williams et al. (Williams) in view of U.S. Patent 6,002,427 to Kipust.

15. Regarding claims 9, 15, and 26, Williams discloses an apparatus and method as claimed, but does not disclose video content including computer-displayed text or graphics. Kipust discloses an apparatus and method for controlling access to

information, wherein the content is computer-displayed text or graphics (fig. 1, labels 102, 104, 116, 118; col. 3, ll. 40-54, col. 4, ll. 1-28, 64-67, and col. 5, ll. 1-6, 44-57).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Williams to include controlling access to computer-displayed text and graphics in order to assist parents in controlling the children's access to Internet content.

Conclusion

16. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).


A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Andrew Y Koenig whose telephone number is (703) 306-0399. The examiner can normally be reached on M-Th (7:30 - 6:30).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Andrew Faile can be reached on (703) 305-4380. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 872-9314 for regular communications and (703) 872-9314 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 306-0377.

ayk
February 24, 2003


ANDREW FAILE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600